G.R.S IX—5]

Previous references
Rel 30 – 10 GS 412, 424 (
53, 52, 59, 166
Rel 30 – 10 GS 415, 417, 418, 421, 423
Later references
Rel 21-23 (53, 63, 69
Rel 21-23 – 178, 179

File No 21
Serial Nos 8, 10, 17, 22, 23
27—29

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos

Part B for December 1923

SUBJECT
Petition from Agamudaiyar Kshatriya Sangam & others of Vellakkara town praying for consideration of the scheme for construction framed by the Municipality on a site reserved for a public place

8129 To R Krishna Rao Esq, the petitioner
Secretary, Bangalore
Letter dt 11 12 23
Informing the petitioners that the Dy Comm'r Chitaldrug has been requested to cancel the licence

Mr Jones 29-12-23

G R S 11] 1923

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(manual)

NOTES

File No 21

FILE HEADING

Petitions from The Chittaldrug &c

From

M/ B Venkata Rao Advocate, Bangalore for the appellants Smt Rama Reddy & other residents of Chitaldrug

No. Petn Dated 23-8-23 Received 30-8-23

Diary No 1132	Enclos 1	Spare Copies	Serial No 8

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

appeals against the order of Dy Com^r Chitaldrug confirming the Watchmen cess of the Hola Olkere Tax & levied on a site-no 97 measuring 15 x 9 yds within the municipal limits, and against the use of public places and requests to issue a stay order on the respondents forbidding any levy on the said site.

NOTES AND ORDERS

1 The order of the Dy Com^r appealed against has not been produced

2 The facts of the case briefly are:—

1) The site in question which was originally in possession of watchmen cess was received by the Mdy to the extent

NOTES—First Sheet

G R S III 2]

1152

General and Revenue Secretariat

Ul File No 21 of 1922

Serial No.

A

& he set apart as a public place in the interests of the sanitation of the Town especially as it was close to a public well and the occupant thereof who had been thereon putting up walls on the said site was prohibited & do it by the Mcty. The occupant hatchaverayan appealed to Govt. The Govt thereupon ordered to resume the site under the Land Acqn Regulation &c.

vide £3000 dt 16.10.22
Ul 21-22-22

And it appears that no steps were taken to acquire the site accordingly.

ii) It is now alleged that a caveat against the mandapam and the orders of Govt above refd to the site in question has been permitted to be built upon by the present Dy. Coll. and the present occupant having obtained a license therefor evidently from the Mcty has been putting walls thereon. Hence the present prayer of the appellants.

iii) The action of the mandapam in having remained silent & subsequently acquiescing in the order of D.C. & not-caveating hence it is also doubtful what action had to be taken by the D.C. under Secs 173 & 174 of the Act, in the matter under such circumstances, & this matter

NOTE-

KJ.
31/8/22

G R S .III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No 21 of 1923

Serial No.

3. [illegible] has not been done and the [illegible] which an appeal has been filed has not been stated. It is not usual to entertain an [illegible] which have not passed any hurdle to their appeals in the lower courts

Sd. [illegible] A copy of the Endt issued to the Petrs by the Asstt of the Collector in No. [illegible] subsequently rec'd in this Office and D no 1173 is also placed on the file -

29/9-

5/9/23 [illegible]

28 9.23

Rec'd 5.30pm
pp 29 9 23 5. [illegible]

30/9/23

2624
1-X-23

1 10 23

6. A Reply may be called for

14/10

8

15/10

15/10

7 Draft [illegible] 15 10

8. The circumstances under which the President of the Municipal Council issued a building license to the present occupant of the site in question in [illegible] the provisions of the Bye-laws of the Municipal Council, have been explained in the [illegible] Remarks Endorsement dt 8/10/23 forwarded to Petrs by him and since rec'd in this Office Sd /

Sd/ appointed as at 10 noted above in the margin -

Note—Contn. sheet

G R. S 111-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

MC File No 21 of 1923

Serial No

A- Therefore clear whether any report-s have been called for.

4. Draft Calling for the same whereon ~~Serial~~ will refer to paras 6 & 7 above

16/10/23
31

to issue the draft at once

3 11 23

17

To

The D C Chitaldrug

No L 330 of 9 8 11 23

calls for a report on the petn of Aravinda Bhima Shetty and others of Holalkere town appealing against the D Co order permitting the Hutchaveerakka to build on the ML Site no 971 intended to be set apart as a public place

Sun

D No 2834

22 Telegramme dated 19 11 23 from the towns people of Holalkere, praying Cancellation of the license granted to Hutchaveeregowda and for the issue of immediate Stay orders prohibiting further Construction of the building

11) The previous petitions were forwarded

NOTE—Contn sheet

G. R. S III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat

Jud File No. 2836/21 of 1923

(5-

Serial No.	
	to the Deputy Commissioner Chitaldrug District on the 8th instant for a detailed report
	Submitted for orders 20/11/23
	21/11/23 Jd to A Secretary
	14) Dy Comrs report has been received today. The case will be worked up & submitted
	21/11/23
	15) Yes 21/11/23
3No 2858	23 Letter no C 80 and 23-24 dated 17th Nov 1923 from the Deputy Commissioner Chitaldrug District forwarding the detailed report with the connected records.
	16) The facts of the case have been fully explained in the Deputy Commissioner's letter (P & D) The Deputy Commissioner in agreeing with the Sub-Division Officer who made a report after local enquiry passes orders permitting Hutchinvenaya (respondent) to construct the building.
	17) Attention is invited to Para 16 of the report (P & D) and also to the observations made by the Deputy

Reported today, file work up to 21/11/23

flag A

flag B

Note—Contn. sheet.

G R. S III 2,

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 214 of 1923

Serial No

flag R

Commissioner's order, permitting the respondent to build the house

10) Submitted for orders with reference to W/Tel of 19.11.23 (para 13 supra)

22.11.23 HK

25.11.23

2) Ld Ld Secretary

3) The order of the D.C. seems to be a nuisance.

In accordance with the letter of Revenue dated 16th Oct 1922, asking for requiring the Municipal Council to take proceedings to acquire the land, the Municipal Council did not take any such proceedings. This is probably due to the fact that as observed by D.C. the land was not required for a public purpose.

4) Under the circumstances shown we submit that the respondent should be allowed to proceed with the construction of the house.

× flag J (Collection Entrust)

NOTE—Contn sheet.

1858

(7

G R S III 2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No | of 19

Serial No

It is true that there was a meeting of the Indian Committee in connection with the Congress but the Congress has not all the demands stated by the Hon'ble the Mover of the Resolution will be confirmed.

First Member

24/11

24/11

20) I do not think that the Government ought to disregard the final vote passed by the Municipality which was confirmed by the Govt in all its details and also the subsequent vote of the Govt suspending the acquisition of the site for granting license to the Company. If the Municipality is removed by the Govt or if the Govt was unwilling they should have made a reference upon first. The vote is in close proximity

NOTE—Contn sheet

8

7 R S III-21

2836
1956

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. of 19

Serial No

his wife and any conditions prescribed for restricting his use of it are to be duly observed. Besides the Municipal Council has no power to surrender his tenure of the land which he holds upon the Municipality may require it for its own purposes but in such case he is entitled to be duly compensated. If his petition be allowed another piece of land may be given to him.

Mehr
26/11

26/11

2) Draft 26/11

2) Dft letter to the D.C & Dft Endt to the petitioner thro' their Advocate submd

29/11/28

30 11 28

& Secretary

3) Draft submitted for orders. Read as

(30124)
Another petition on the same subject addressed thro' the office of the Private Secretary to HH the Maharaja is also placed in the file.

24) Dft & o submd, together with the Dft Endt

3/12/28

1/12

1/12

NOTE—Contn sheet

G R. S. III-2.

1187
1173
3012

General and Revenue Secretariat.	A C File No. 24 of 1923

Serial No

25 A revised draft Rep. & a draft Endt are put up

Refer Para 23

& to Secretary

Draft may be approved

ve 263 7/12 ✓ First number

28 To

The A C - Chittaranjan

No. L 4418 9/11/23

which, for reasons mentioned, that the licence be cancelled, the site be acquired & suitable compensation be paid to the Cooperative Society & also that of the Cooperative Stores, be given and the site of canal extended

Notes—Contn. sheet.



L
1132-23

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Municipal Appeal No. /23-24.

1532
29 5 23

Appellants.	Vs.	Respondent.
Anantha Bhima Setti & other Towns' people of Holalkere in Chitaldrug District.		Vecbhuthi Hutchaveerayya, resident of Holalkere Town in Chitaldrug Dt.

****

The appellants above-named humbly beg to - appeal to the Government against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug District N.Dis.35. Ml.23-24 dated 15-8-1923 communicated to them - through the Municipal President of Holalkere in his No.9 dated 20-8-1923 re. permission granted to the Respondent to put up a building on a site Khanesumari No.971 measuring 15 by 9 yards -

A. Facts of the Case.-

On the report submitted by the Amildar of Holalkere on 10-2-1921, the then Deputy Commissioner Mr.C.Venkata Rao ordered that no dwelling house should be allowed to be built on the site in question which is quite close to the Government well used by all the public. Then the respondent Hutchaveerayya appealed to the Government against the said order and prayed for its cancellation. But the Government declined to accede to the respondent's request and ordered the acquisition of the site. Subsequently after the change of the

the personnel in the Office of the Deputy Commissioner, the Respondent applied to Mr.Syed Taj - Peeran for license to build a house on the site - and the latter passed an order granting license on conditions that the Respondent should not open any entrance towards the well and that he should not construct any latrine in the viscinity. There upon the Municipal Board discussed the question in a meeting, resolved that the land in question should be acquired as the local Medical Officer was of - of opinion that the construction of the house close to the well was injurious to Public Health and - reported the same fact to the then Deputy Commissioner Mr.Syed Taj Peeran who ordered in January 1923 that a declaration statement may be sent up for the acquisition of the land. While the matter was in this stage the Respondent moved in February 1923 the succeeding Deputy Commissioner Mr.R.Nanaswami Rao for granting him permission to build a house on the site in question. The latter granted the license in his No.N.Dis.182/M1.22-23 dated - 12-6-1923 against the resolution of the Municipal Board and the Government Order passed in April 1921. On this the appellants presented an application to the Deputy Commissioner to reconsider his order and to revoke the license granted. In response to this the appellants have received the endorsement herewith submitted to the effect that acquisition proceedings are unnecessary and license wes granted properly. In consequence of these

these proceedings the Respondent has expeaited the construction of his house and has bult up walls 2 to 3 feet above the surface level.

B. Grounds of Appeal.-

1. That the Order of the learned Deputy Commissioner is irregular and opposed to the spirit of the provision of the Mysore Municipal Regulation

2. That the learned Deputy Commissioner's order prohibiting the acquisition of the site as ordered by Government and as validly resolved by the Municipality in their duly constituted meeting is opposed to Sections 173 and 174 of Mysore Municipal Regulation.

3. That the learned Deputy Commissioner has erred in making a summary order of prohibition without consulting the Municipal Board and obtaining their reply as contemplated in Section 173 (1) Sub Sec.(2).

4. That the learned Deputy Commissioner has again erred in not forwarding forth with to the Government a copy of his order with reasons therefor in order to obtain the final orders of the Government in the matter as contemplated in Section 174 Sub Section (2).

5. That the learned Deputy Commissioner was not justified in over-looking and over-riding the Medical opinion as to the unsuitability of the site for a dwelling on the ground of inconvenience to Public Health.

6. That the Government having once ordered

ordered acquisition of the site to the Municipality on the Respondent's appeal against the order of the former Deputy Commissioner Mr.C Venkata Rao who held that no dwelling house should be allowed to be built on the site in question as being quite close to the well, the present learned Deputy Commissioner had no jurisdiction to set aside the order confirmed in appeal by the Government and to reopen the question.

7. That the former Deputy Commissioner Mr.Syed Taj Pasran who originally granted a conditional license, having subsequently revoked the license and ordered the acquisition, proceedings being pushed on, the present learned Deputy Commissioner has erred in over-looking the previous order and in granting the license.

C. Prayer.

Wherefore the appellants pray that the Government may be pleased to set aside the order of the present Deputy Commissioner referred to, to cancell the license granted to the Respondent and in the meanwhile pending disposel of this appeal to pass an ad interim stay order prohibiting the Respondent from further constructing the building on the site in question in order to obviate inconvenience and irrepairable injury to the Public.

Bangalore,
23-8-1923.

A. [illegible]
Appellant



1923 - 24

G R S VI—c/7]

DRAFT

SUBJECT

Section [illegible]
File No 21-23

No [illegible] Serial No 17

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM

Diary No of letter replied to 1132 / 1173

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,
([illegible])
, the 191

Date of issue 5/11/23

Signed by [illegible]

The accompanying Petition Registered No 1132 dated 23 8 1923, received at the General and Revenue Secretariat from [illegible] Rao, Advocate, Bangalore on behalf of the applicants Annaji Ramarao Sathe & others of the Kolaba Dist praying [illegible] against the order of Dy. Com'r, Kolaba dtd [illegible] in Watandhareerajya & bonded upon the award vide no 971 interdicted & the date of [illegible] public place is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Deputy Com'r, Kolaba, with reference to the Revenue Dept's letter no L3008 dtd 21-22-23 for [illegible]

The 16th Oct 22

By Order,

3/11/23
Secretary to Government

16/11/23

31

PTO

ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ಸಹಿ/-

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಕೂಡಲೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿ

ಮೇರೆಗೆ

ಇಂದಾಗ್ಯೆ ಹೆಮ್ಮೆಯಿಂ

ನಂಬುಗೆಯ

ಆಜ್ಞಾನುಸಾರ

By Order,

Secretary to Government

List of enclosures

Copied by.

Examined by

WD 1966—GPB—1,000—21-1-19



N B —The name of the Sender, if telegraphed, is written after the text.

La Chand & Sons, 1911—

N B —Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, they should be pasted, or slips pasted on, this form.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Chitaldrug District.
Dated Chitaldrug, 17th November 1923.

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Chitaldrug District.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Local & Legislative Departments,
B A N G A L O R E.

Sir,

With reference to your official memorandum No.L.3307/M1. 21-23-17 dated 5th November 1923 calling for a detailed report on the petition presented by Mr B. Krishna Rao, Advocate, Bangalore, on behalf of the appellants Anantha Bhima Setty and others of the Holalkere town appealing against my order permitting one V. Hutchu-Veeriah to construct a building on site No.971 in Holalkere town, I have the honor to state as follows:-

2 The respondent HutchuVeeriah owned a house in the old fort near the insanitary ditch and the place having become very unhealthy, he applied for the grant of site No.971 in question measuring 9 X 25 yards with a view to shift himself to a better locality. The municipal council granted the applicant the said site at an upset price of 2 annas per square yard (vide copy of resolution dated 30th September 1920, pherist No. 5).

3 On this resolution of the Municipal Council, certain inhabitants of the Holalkere town presented a petition on 1st October 192 to the President of the said Municipal Council complaining that th site in question should not be disposed of to a private party on the ground that the same is situated close to a public well and tha the disposal of site would cause obstruction to the public in going to the temple of Kanyaka Parameswari under construction.

4 The said petition was brought up before the Municipal council for discussion in their meeting held on 30th November 1920 and it was resolved that as the site in question had already been granted nothing more could be done in the matter and that a license may be granted to Hutchuveeriah for the construction of a building on the

said site subject to the condition that he should keep the ground adjoining the wall in a sanitary condition. Accordingly a license was granted to the applicant on 2nd December 1920 (vide copy of the resolution dated 30th November 1920, pherist No. 9).

5 The townspeople thereupon presented appeal petitions to my predecessor Mr. C. Venkata Rao and also to Government, stating the same facts as before. My predecessor Mr. C. Venkata Rao having inspected the spot in question instructed the President of the Municipal Council to resume a portion of the land (56 ft & 27 ft) adjoining the well in addition to 12 feet of space left between the well and the building and reported the matter to Government in his No.C.207 Ml.20-21 dated 14th March 1921 in reply to the official Memorandum No.R.8493/Ml.30-20-44 dated 29th January 1921 from the Revenue Secretary which arrangement was concurred in by Government and the petitioners were given endorsement to that effect by Government.

6 In accordance with the license originally granted by the Municipal council, Hutchuveeriah had by this time, completed the basement of the building and also raised the wall up to 2½ feet when he was informed of the order passed by my predecessor Mr. C. Venkata Rao requiring him to give up a portion of the site in question close to the well. Then he applied to the Municipal Council to grant him a portion of land to the east of the site in exchange for the portion of the site ordered to be resumed as the remaining site would not be of any use to him for the construction of a building. The question of granting a portion of land towards the east having been referred by the Municipal Council to the opinion of the townspeople, the latter in their mahazar dated 26th September 1921 objected to the grant of the said land on the ground that it would cause inconvenience to the going of cattle and rendering the cart-track narrow and the land not spacious enough for jatra purposes and accordingly the municipal council refused to grant the portion of land applied for, a majority of the councillors voting in support of the mahazar of the townspeople.

(vide copy or the resolution dated 12th October 1921, pherist No. 41).

7 As Kutchuveeriah refused to give up the portion of land ordered to be resumed and as he had used rough stones for basemen instead oi dressed stone as laid down in the conditions of the license granted to the applicant and as he had also encroached upon certain portion of municipal site, further construction of the building was stopped by the Municipal council on 11th February 1921.

8 Kutchuveeriah thereupon appealed to Government in the matter and a reply was received irom Government in Revenue Secretary's letter No.L.3006/M1.21-22-22 dated 16th October 1922 to the effect that ii the individual was not agreeable to give up the portion oi the site in question required to be kept open in the interest of the public, proceedings under Land Acquisition Regula tion would have to be adopted and if he had encroached upon municipal land the proper procedure to the municipal council would be to take suitable proceedings against him instead of resuming the site already granted to him The same was communi- cated to the President of the Municipal Council in this office memo No. D1 Dis. 21 M1.22-23 dated 18th October 1922.

9 Kutchuveeriah presented a petition on 18th December 1922 to my predecessor Mr. A. K. Syed Taj Peeran stating that he had been granted an endorsement by the Government in their No.L.3157 dated 24th October 1922 to the effect that his petition had been for- warded to the Deputy Commissioner for disposal and praying that he may be granted license to construct the building as he is put to great loss on account oi stoppage of the construction or the building by the Municipal council.

10 Thereupon Mr. A. K. Syed Taj Peeran invited the attention of the President or the Municipal Council to the Revenue Secretary's letter referred to above and ordered that license may be granted to the petitioner on condition that he should not keep any opening door &c towards the well and that he should not construct latrine close to the well or accumulate manure in the proximity of the well.

against any instruction issued by Government as stated in the petition, as the Government have not sanctioned the acquisition or the land in question but only suggested the right procedure to be adopted by the Municipal council in certain contingencies. Further the Municipal Council had not submitted definite proposals re the acquisition of the land in question and as such there was no necessity to take action under sections 173 and 174 of the Municipal Regulation as stated in the appeal petition.

19 Appeal ground No.5 - There is no medical opinion on record as to the unsuitability of the site for a dwelling on the ground of inconvenience to public health excepting a reference to the matter in the municipal resolution of the 26th December 1922. However all sanitary requirements and the convenience of the public were duly safe-guarded by the several conditions imposed in the license issued under my order which was also recorded in the municipal meeting held on 15th July 1923.

20 Appeal ground No.6 - My predecessor Mr. C. Venkata Rao had not passed orders that no dwelling house should be allowed to be built on the site in question as stated in the petition but ordered that a certain portion of the site in question should be resumed to the municipality and the question was not finally decided by the municipal council and as such no previous orders have been set aside by my predecessors in office.

21 Appeal ground No.7.- This point has been dealt with fully in paras 9,10 & 11 of this report.

22 The appeal petition with its enclosures and also the marginally noted Vernacular records received from the President of the Municipal Council, Holalkere with his report No.31 dated 11th November 1923 are herewith forwarded for reference and return when done with.

1. Record ending with order No.C.158 Ml.22-23 dated 24th January 1923.
2. ==Do== ending with memo No.N.Dis. 182 Ml.22-23 dated 12th June 1923.

I have the honor to be,
S I R,
Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner.

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
TO HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

Mysore, 26 11 1923

Petition, as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Department, Bangalore, for

By Order,

Private Secretary
to H H the Maharaja of Mysore

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO H H THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE
316
24 NOV 1923

EIGHT ANNAS

Secy. to Govt.

before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore Bangalore

Municipal appeal no of 1923-24

Appellants Ananta Kheema Setty and other Towns people of Holalkere, in Chitaldroog District	}	~~Appellant~~ Respondent Vibhuthi Huchaveriah resident of Holalkere Town Chitaldroog 1132 of 2R 26

not examined in time allowed In Continuation of their appl application dated 28th August 1923, pray for the Cancelling the Licence granted to the Respondent to put up a building a site Khaneshumari no 971 in the town of Holalkere, the appellants above named humbly beg to state that it is learnt that though it is already more than 2 months since the presentation of the appeal, neither the records connected with the case have been called for nor an adinterim stay order prohibiting the Respondent from further constructing the building the site in question as already pray for, has yet been passed The Respt has taken advantage of the mon delay caused in not taking early steps on the appeal application rapidly constructing





building on the sight in question.

99) The appelants humbly pray that stay order prohibiting the Respondent from further Construction of the building, may be passed immediately in order to obviate the inconvenience and irreparable injury to the public, pending final orders in the case

A. Sampath Reddy

D. Maheshwaraiah

Appellants Advocate

Two 26½

Ml 21-23-28

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

R e a d -

1) Appeal petition presented by Mr B Krishna Rao, Advocate, Bangalore, on behalf of Anantha Bhima Setty and others of the Holalkere Town, praying for the -- cancellation of the license granted to V. Hutchuveeriah to construct a building on site No 971 in the Holalkere Town.

2) Correspondence ending with letter No 80-M L.23-24 dated the 17th November 1923, from the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug District, submitting a detailed report on the above appeal petition

O r d e r No L4418 Revenue

Bangalore, 11th December 192

Government consider that the Deputy Commissioner was not right in granting the license to the counter petitioner to build his house, disregarding the final - order passed by Mr C Venkata Rao, Deputy Commissioner, which was confirmed by Govt in their Memo No R 11527/Ml 30-20-66 dated the 18th April 1921 and also the subsequent - order No L.3006/Ml 21-22-22 dated the - 16th October 1922, suggesting the acquisition of the site and that if he had - thought that a revision of the orders was necessary, a separate reference should -- have been sent up for orders The site -

is in close proximity to the well and any conditions prescribed for restricting the use of it are sure to be disregarded. Besides the Municipal Council has no power to enforce the conditions after the site is built upon Therefore, Government direct that the license be cancelled, the site be acquired and the counter-petitioner be suitably compensated If the counter-petitioner so desires, another site of equal extent may be given to him

SECRETARY TO GOVT
AND L DEPARTMENTS

To

The D C , Chitaldrug Dt , with the records

E W M

G R S G/33]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(*Continuation sheet draft form*)

two drafts

Endorsement 11/11/25

To

Mr B Krishnarao,

Advocate,

Bangalore City

In reply to the appeal petn presented by him on behalf of Smt Tara Bhima Selly & others of Halakere, praying for the Cancellation of the licence granted to V Hutchuvenah to construct a building on site no 971 in the town, the petitioners are informed that ~~the Dy Comr of the Chitradurga Dn has considered the matter~~ has been requested to cancel Cancellation of the licence ~~vide letter no dated 21-8-25~~

Dy

The receipt for annas twelve paid by the townspeople, issued by the Telegraph Deptt & received with their telegram dd 19/11/25 is herewith returned

B O

29/11/25

Dy Secy

VD 2250—GPE—1 60,000—26-7-20